

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-16 have been examined. New claims 17-24 have been added to further describe the patentable features of the present invention.

**Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw this rejection in view of the self-explanatory claim amendments made herein.

**Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Fujimori (US 7,009,942) in view of Fellman (6,980,990). Applicants traverse the rejection based on the following comments.

Claim 1, as proposed, recites:

recognizing a first device that has been connected to a network **without being assigned any nickname, wherein the nickname identifies a characteristic of the first device and can be recognized by the network**;

selecting a nickname for the recognized first device from a recommended nickname table which is also connected to the network; and

registering information regarding the selected nickname in a nickname registration-managing module connected to the network. (emphasis added)

The claimed method, thus, sets forth, *inter alia*, recognizing a first device that has been connected to a network without being assigned a nickname.

The Examiner asserts that Fujimori clearly teaches in column 8, lines 27-29, that a line name and an apparatus (Fig. 4A and col. 8, line 36) and is automatically assigned when the apparatus is connected to a LAN. The Examiner also asserts that a line name is no different than a nickname and the Examiner notes that the claims do not recite function of the nickname. Rather, the Examiner asserts that when broadly interpreted, the claims merely recite assigning a name to a device when the device is connected to a network.

However, despite assigning a line name to each physical terminal of an apparatus when the apparatus is connected to the mLAN system, Fujimori teaches that each apparatus still has at least one name assigned to the apparatus before the apparatus is connected to the mLAN system (e.g., MD1, MD2, and MD3). For example, MD1 is provided by the apparatus itself and is not a name generated by the connection apparatus (see col. 3, lines 45-49). Specifically, the connection setting apparatus has a connection information acquiring unit for acquiring first connection information, such as a name of the apparatus, from a plurality of apparatuses connected to the network, and a generating unit for generating second connection information (Abstract and col. 7, line 61 to col. 8, line 45).

Figures 4A, 4B, 5A and 5B are lists showing the connection state of the mLAN system and the lists are displayed in accordance with the apparatus information and connection information (col. 7, lines 61-66). Figure 4A, for example, shows an apparatus name “MD1” as a name of the apparatus connected to the connection apparatus and is acquired from the apparatus before a user sets the connection state (col. 8, lines 11-14). Further, the name of the apparatus is not generated by the connection apparatus. Similarly, apparatus MD2 and apparatus MD3 each have their own names prior to connecting to the network. Fujimori does not teach or suggest that

an apparatus being connected to the connection apparatus is connected without any nickname. Instead, Fujimori clearly teaches that the apparatus has a name which it provides as apparatus information and that associations with the connection apparatus are created and assigned thereafter.

Also, the line names MIDlin1, MIDlin2 and MIDlin3 are merely assigned to physical terminals of an apparatus and do not identify a characteristic of the first device. Also, MD1 is a name of an apparatus, such as keyboard (see col. 3, lines 45-49). MD2 and MD3, on the other hand, are names of apparatuses, such as built-in tone generators or automatic music performance players (see col. 4, lines 15-18 and 47-50). It is not readily apparent from “MD1” “MD2” or “MD3” what the apparatus is. Neither MD1, MD2 or MD3 identifies a characteristic of the apparatus.

Furthermore, as previously argued in the Response filed on January 2, 2008, claim 1 is directed to “automatically determining a device’s nickname.” Fellman plainly states the user is able to select one of more names from the table for registration. Thus, neither reference, either alone or in combination, teaches or suggests automatically determining a nickname for a device which is connected to the network without any nickname, specifically, by selecting a nickname for the recognized device from a recommended nickname table, the nickname identifying a characteristic of the device.

Moreover, Applicants submit that, contrary to the Examiner’s assertion, Fujimori is not directed to a name selection system. Rather, as discussed above, Fujimori is merely directed to a

“connection setting apparatus.”<sup>1</sup> As such, Applicants submit that one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, would not be motivated for the reasons set forth by the Examiner, since Fujimori is not directed to a name selection system.

Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable for at least these reasons.

Similarly, Applicants submit that independent claims 7, 9, 13 and 14 are patentable for analogous reasons. Further, Applicants submit that dependent claims 2-6, 8, 10-12, 15 and 16 are patentable at least by virtue of their respective dependencies on claims 1, 7, 9 and 14. Claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 10, and 11 have also been amended to recite additional features which are not taught or suggested by the current art of record.

Regarding claims 5, 6, 7, 8 and 16, the Examiner asserts the claimed features are inherent. Specifically, the Examiner states, “[t]hat is exactly why newly connected device requires name assignment so as to be uniquely identified in a network.” However, as noted above, the asserted combination of Fujimori and Fellman fails to teach or suggest all the features of claim 1. Since Fujimori does not teach assigning a name to an apparatus connected to the network, Fujimori fails to teach recognizing a first device that has been connected to a network without being assigned any nickname and selecting a nickname for the recognized first device. Thus, Fujimori, alone or in combination with Fellman, fails to teach or suggest the specific combination of steps recited in claims 5, 6, 7 and 8, and the features of claim 16.

---

<sup>1</sup> See also, *Fujimori*, Title.

**New Claims**

By this Amendment, Applicants have added new claims 17-24 to further define the claimed invention. Applicants respectfully submit claims 17-24 recite additional features which are not taught or suggested by the prior art of record.

**Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Ryan F. Heavener  
Registration No. 61,512

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: March 9, 2009